

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated August 17, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application before submission of this paper. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 13, 18 and 20 are amended. Claim 19 is cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-18 and 20 are currently pending. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,427 issued to *Wu*. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Wu* in view of *Peiya Liu*. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Office Action did not address one of the limitations of Claim 1. The Office Action states that the limitation was not addressed because claim language that suggests an option that does not require a step to be performed does not limit the scope of the claim. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to remove the option such that only required steps are included in the method claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the examination of all of the limitations of Claim 1.

The Office Action rejected independent Claim 1 by citing a procedure described in *Wu* for searching objects during synchronization. Claim 1, as amended, recites, "receiving a first manifest of modifications to a data store, wherein the first manifest is compatible with a synchronization protocol that does not support add events; comparing the first manifest of modifications to a list of objects within a mobile data store; and creating a second manifest of modifications by altering the first manifest, wherein the second manifest is compatible with a synchronization protocol that supports add events, and wherein the first manifest is altered to reflect that a particular modification is associated with an add event for an object not on the list of objects within the mobile data store when the particular modification identified in the first manifest is interpreted as being associated with a change event for the object not on the list of objects." The limitations recited in amended Claim 1 are significantly different from the procedure in *Wu* cited by the Office Action.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Page 6 of 8

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated August 17, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

*Wu* is directed to creating, comparing, and updating objects in an object store. For example, “[s]ynchronization manager implements the synchronization protocol to allow a comparison between corresponding objects stored in object store in mobile device and object store in desktop computer, to receive objects from object store, and to update objects in object store.” (col. 6, lines 22-26) “[A]pplication programming interfaces allow the creation of databases for different types of objects, and allow application programs to write and read property names and values to and from respective objects within object store.” (col. 6, lines 36-39)

*Wu* does not disclose the limitations as recited in Applicant’s amended Claim 1. Specifically, *Wu* does not teach a “first manifest...compatible with a synchronization protocol that does not support add events,” and a “second manifest...compatible with a synchronization protocol that supports add events,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Thus, the *Wu* procedure is different and, more significantly, does not anticipate the method as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention recited in amended independent Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by *Wu* and is allowable.

Claims 11 and 18, as amended, include limitations substantially similar (albeit different in other important ways) to the limitations claimed in Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Thus, Claims 11 and 18 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

As discussed above, independent Claims 1, 11 and 18, as amended, are allowable. Thus, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-17 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that the base claims on which they rely are allowable, and notice to that effect is solicited.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

App. No. 09/892,677  
Amendment dated August 17, 2004  
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan  
Registration No. 47,981  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6254  
JJF/ab

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Page 8 of 8